HUMAN RIGHTS RAPID RESPONSE MONITORING SURVEY REPORT

Prepared for BHR/OTI and PPC

by

Ryan S. McCannell
Research Assistant

July 1995

Overview

This report summarizes the results of a survey administered by the Research and Reference Services Project of USAID's Center for Development Information and Evalution (CDIE) for the Agency's Office of Transition Initiatives (OTI) and the Policy and Program Coordination Bureau (PPC). The purpose of the survey was to gauge the existing capacity among non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and other non-profit associations for human rights rapid response monitoring activities. The participants were invited to share their comments about human rights monitoring and USAID's potential role.

The findings can be summarized as follows:

" None of the 25 surveyed organizations have sufficient capacity to undertake human rights monitoring on short notice (i.e., within one week).

" Two organizations (America's Development Foundation and Freedom House) have significant expertise in several aspects of human rights monitoring activities. However, neither of the two NGOs had a rapid response capability for mobilizing large numbers of volunteers in a crisis situation.

>   " Several of the other surveyed organizations possessed significant expertise in one or more aspects of the monitoring process. For example:
>
>   " Five organizations maintain computerized databases that contain the names of several thousand volunteers, many of whom could be identified, screened, and contacted within 24 hours of an emergency alert.
>
>   " Two suitable monitor training programs have been developed that could be conducted within two weeks' time.
>
>   " Three organizations specialize in providing logistical support to relief operations.

Altogether, these complementary NGO resources offer several cost-effective methods to rapidly deploy human rights monitors.

In terms of NGO commentary, the organizations generally agreed that there was a significant lack of coordination and commitment among donors and the UN in the field of human rights. While the respondents unanimously advocated a role for NGOs in human rights monitoring, they disagreed as to what the proper role of the UN and USAID should be. Most found the UN's Human Rights Center (UNHRC) to be ineffectual and overly bureaucratic in its operations in Rwanda. Nearly all of the respondents cautioned against a visible role for the Agency with regard to monitoring. They agreed instead that USAID should limit its activities to funding training activities for monitors and building the capacity of human rights NGOs and/or the

UNHRC. One respondent offered a unique example of coordination that envisioned the UNHRC, international NGOs, and indigenous human rights monitors combining their strengths in a three-level organizational structure.

Methodology

Ryan McCannell and Heather McHugh of R&RS conducted the NGO survey between May 16 and June 6, 1995. The contact list of organizations was compiled using information from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the Human Rights Internet, and the InterAction Member Profiles publication, as well as referrals and suggestions gathered in the course of contacting organizations. In all, 77 organizations were identified as potential respondents; of these, 48 were contacted, and 25 provided enough substantive data to be included in the results. A table showing the complete list of organizations, including those successfully contacted, follows this report as Attachment 1.

Several constraints kept the R&RS survey team from successfully contacting all the NGOs on the list. Wrong or disconnected phone numbers eliminated 10 organizations, and fax transmissions to most of the eight overseas NGOs resulted in no responses. The busy nature of many organizations' offices also had a negative effect. For example, seven domestic NGOs asked for a fax containing the eight-page questionnaire, and despite repeated phone calls, only two of the seven took the time to respond. Lastly, the time and staff limitations reduced the survey team's ability to follow through with hard-to-reach contacts.

Despite these limitations, 17 questionnaires were completed, five telephone interviews were conducted, and three completed questionnaires arrived by fax and mail. Steve Golub's recommendations for the questionnaire were followed, with a few modifications. A copy of the questionnaire is added to this report as Attachment 2.

NGO Human Rights Monitoring Capacity

According to the data collected from the survey, none of the responding organizations could claim to "corner the market" in human rights rapid response monitoring. However, several NGOs had significant experience in one or more components of an overall monitoring capability. The following paragraphs examine the organizations with the broadest current capacity for human rights monitoring, as well as NGOs that maintain well-managed rosters of volunteers, provide logistical support for relief missions, and train human rights monitors. Taken together, these organizations provide a wealth of expertise for future human rights monitoring activities.

Organizations with Broad Monitoring Experience

The two organizations with the most substantial expertise and capacity to undertake human rights monitoring activities are America's Development Foundation (ADF) and Freedom House. Indeed, the two NGOs share several important characteristics: both work to promote human

rights as part of an overall democracy program that focuses on building civil society and democratic institutions; both have substantial experience and ongoing contact with human rights NGOs throughout the developing world; both have set up their own training programs for human rights advocates and monitors; and both have received funding from USAID and the National Endowment for Democracy.

Unfortunately, the two organizations share many of the same constraints. Neither ADF nor Freedom House is able to regularly respond to crises in a rapid manner (i.e., in less than a month's time). Both organizations have concentrated on human rights advocacy and activism training rather than monitoring; their in-house monitoring capabilities are limited to staff members and a handful of associated volunteers; and both have a limited reach in terms of putting monitors in the field in times of crisis. However, ADF and Freedom House each maintain such an extensive network among indigenous NGOs that they could certainly increase their capacity for rapid response, should the need arise.

Organizations with Volunteer Databases

In terms of rostering volunteers, five organizations have developed computerized databases for their volunteer lists. Foremost among these NGOs are Volunteers in Overseas Cooperative Assistance (VOCA), with 4,500 volunteers in their system, and the National Peace Corps Association (NPCA), with 3,000 names. These two organizations maintain similar types of databases, with search fields that include relevant experience, present employer, areas of interest and specialization, and language skills. However, each organization uses its database for different purposes, which result in a significant difference in the time it takes for them to choose volunteers.

VOCA provides volunteers for agriculture related projects in developing countries. The NGO identifies potential volunteers through recruitment at its field offices, some advertising, and by word-of-mouth. VOCA usually interviews and screens applicants before choosing them as volunteers, a vetting process that can take up to three weeks. Both VITA and Doctors of the World have databases and application processes similar to VOCA's.

In contrast, the NPCA relies on its membership of Returned Peace Corps Volunteers (RPCVs) for its database. Since the Association maintains ongoing contacts with RPCVs and can vouch for their expertise, it can quickly identify qualified individuals, usually within 24 hours. Physicians for Human Rights has a similar membership database containing about 1,000 names.

The significant difference in response time between VOCA and NPCA derives from the way each organization uses its database. Whereas VOCA includes unscreened candidates in its system, membership in the NPCA acts as a *de facto* screening process for volunteers. As a result, VOCA uses its database as a preliminary tool in searching for appropriate volunteers, while NPCA employs it as one of the final steps.   Drawing from these comparisons, an NGO's capacity for rapid response increases if its volunteer database includes pre-screened applicants,

rather than names of candidates.

Organizations with Suitable Training Experience

In the realm of training human rights monitors, the survey identified two notable programs: the U.N. Human Rights Center Geneva/Kigali training course organized by the Congressional Hunger Center and the NPCA; and the one-week monitoring course developed by the Diokno Foundation of the Philippines.

The Geneva/Kigali program offered volunteers a two-week "crash-course" in monitoring techniques for the UNHRC's efforts in Rwanda. As the name implies, the first week of training was based at UN offices in Geneva, while the second week of training took place at the UN operations center in the Rwandan capital. The National Peace Corps Association referred both trainers and monitoring volunteers for the Rwanda mission.

This program was evaluated by Don Schramm, coordinator of the University of Wisconsin/Madison's Disaster Management Center, which has developed a 600-hour self-study course on disaster monitoring and relief recommended by the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance for its volunteer training. Mr. Schramm strongly advocated the Geneva/Kigali program as a model for training human rights monitors.[1]

The Diokno Foundation training program consists of a one-week course on monitoring techniques for indigenous human rights monitors. The training includes instruction on how to identify human rights abuses, interview eyewitness victims, record interviews, and prepare write-ups for the UN and local NGOs to use and disseminate. The Cambodian Documentation Center (CDC) has employed the Diokno Foundation trainers for their own human rights education classes in refugee camps in Thailand, and in recent years, within Cambodia. Although the CDC has been superseded by local NGOs, its director still keeps abreast of the latest developments in the region and is extremely knowledgeable about the Diokno training program.

Logistical Support Organizations

In certain crisis situations, NGOs and donors have sometimes relied on other organizations for transportation into the crisis area, and for logistical support once deployed. A few of the surveyed organizations specialize in providing such services for monitoring and other rapid-response activities. Two companies, Air-Serv International and Southern Air Transport, have supplied air transportation for relief missions over the past two decades. More recently, the Congressional Hunger Center has acted as the logistical coordinator for the UNHRC's mission in Rwanda. All three organizations have significant expertise in Africa, and each seems capable of

---

[1] Unfortunately, the Congressional Hunger Center contact was overseas and could not provide more information on the training ram. Hopefully, he can supply materials on the monitor training course, if OTI is interested in examining them.

expanding or diverting its operations to other regions should they be drawn upon as a resource for future monitoring activities around the globe.

Air-Serv International specializes in single and twin engine air transportation. Their past experience focused in East and Central Africa, where Air-Serv maintains six bases of operations from regional headquarters in Nairobi. Response time for air operations is one week's time, or less within Africa. The company takes pride in having completed "13,000,000 miles of flying into remote areas torn by civil strife, and sustained no flight-related fatalities or serious injuries."[2] Air-Serv's fleet of small passenger planes are appropriate for transporting personnel and high-value cargo, although the company has undertaken large-scale, sustained humanitarian airlift operations as well. Air-Serv provides its services on a cost-recovery basis, and is therefore technically an NGO.

Southern Air Transport, on the other hand, is a private company that operates a fleet of fifteen C-150 cargo planes. C-150s are capable of transporting 20 tons of cargo, including vehicles, tanked materials such as insecticides, and airdrops of food and other emergency supplies. These planes can regularly accommodate 18 passengers, or up to 90 with a waiver from the FAA. Southern Air Transport's past experience includes USAID humanitarian response operations in Africa, as well as contract work for the UN, European NGOs, the Indian Government, and as part of the U.S. Department of Defense Civil Reserve Airfleet. Response time for relief operations is 48 hours, depending on availability and the current position of its aircraft.

As for on-the-ground logistical support, the Congressional Hunger Center has been responsible for facilitating the operations of the newly created UN Human Rights Center in its monitoring efforts in Rwanda. In addition to arranging for training, the Hunger Center conducted negotiations between the UNHRC and the UN peacekeeping office for transportation, security, housing, and some backup personnel. The Hunger Center expects to continue in its role as a logistical facilitator until the UNHRC becomes capable of handling human rights monitoring activities on its own. Its experiences may provide OTI with some insight into the capacity of UNHRC and some of the obstacles that need to be considered in planning monitoring activities.

NGO Advice and Comments

In addition to the factual information that the respondents provided about their experience and capacity, they were invited to share their comments about human rights monitoring and USAID's potential role. More specifically, the respondents were asked six questions, which are listed below with a summary of the respective responses.

1. **How should human rights monitoring be integrated with other activities that respond to rapid transitions or humanitarian crises? (12 responses)**

---

[2] This information was taken from a fact sheet provided by Air-Serv.

The respondents tended to answer this question by stressing what they felt was the most important focus of human rights monitoring activities, and then tying this focus into the question of rapid transitions. Five of the 12 mentioned NGO capacity building as the most important element of monitoring operations; for example, training local NGOs to do the monitoring themselves, in the midst of crises, was seen as essential to the success of monitoring efforts. Three respondents mentioned "security" or "protection" as the most important aspect, again in terms of local monitors and monitoring NGOs. Two respondents cited the need for extensive training of the monitoring volunteers provided by donors or foreign NGOs. Another suggested that monitoring be used as an evaluation tool for democratization or rule of law projects, and also as a backup to civil society and institution building efforts.

2.   In your opinion, how should future human rights monitoring activities be coordinated (through the U.N., consortia, other donors, etc.)? (14 responses)

Responses to this question were strong and varied. Six respondents cited an NGO-led consortium as the most effective means of coordinating human rights monitoring activities. Their reasoning centered around criticisms of the UN, which was labeled "too labyrinthine," "overly bureaucratic," "too political," and "weak." At the same time, respondents generally recognized that such a consortium would need some affiliation with the UN, because the latter "contributes prestige" to such operations.

The five advocates of a UN-coordinated system admitted that the UNHRC is ill-equipped at present to handle global human rights monitoring activities. One pro-UN respondent suggested scrapping the Center altogether and starting anew; another stated that the UN's weakness in Rwanda was due to a lack of proper funding and commitment by donors. A third offered a model in which the UN coordinates a trust fund for NGOs to undertake human rights related activities in consortium form, similar to the South Africa NGO trust fund currently in operation.

The most intriguing response centered around the idea that monitoring activities should consist of three levels, with the UN at the top level for authority, prestige, and broad supervision; donor-driven NGOs in the middle, providing flexibility, rapid response capability, and technical assistance; and indigenous NGOs and volunteers closest to the scene, for their cultural expertise and long-term commitment to monitoring human rights on the local level. This approach would seem to incorporate the strengths of these actors while hopefully covering their individual weaknesses.

3.   What do you see as USAID's potential role in human rights monitoring? (17 responses)

This question provoked several frank responses about the perceived political goals of USAID in the area of human rights. Seven respondents reacted negatively to the idea of the Agency becoming more active in human rights monitoring, citing an "objectivity problem" and "lack of commitment" on the part of the Agency. One respondent went so far as to state that human

rights activities should focus on "empowerment and participation rather than U.S. business promotion."

Aside from such commentary, 12 of the 17 respondents suggested that USAID's role should be limited to funding NGOs, training personnel, and building capacity for indigenous human rights groups. One individual pointed to the Agency's democracy and rule of law programs as the most appropriate means of promoting human rights; another suggested that USAID should concentrate on helping to build the capacity of the UNHRC.

4. How should indigenous organizations and individuals be utilized for human rights monitoring? (15 responses)

All respondents saw participation by indigenous NGOs and individuals as "essential" to successful monitoring activities. 13 out of 15 survey participants recommended using properly-trained, local NGO personnel as monitors, although four respondents underlined the need for protection, anonymity, and the possibility of political asylum for threatened indigenous monitors.

One individual suggested enlisting the support of church leaders for monitoring activities as a means of ensuring a measure of protection. Another advocated a "middle step" between local monitors and their counterparts from the developed world, using regional monitors from nearby countries. In his opinion, monitors from within the region would have some insight into the local affairs, customs, and language(s) of the crisis area, while their status as foreign nationals would offer a measure of protection against attack. At the same time, their presence would tend to be less threatening to information providers than foreign (non-regional) monitors.

5. As a general policy, should the findings of human rights monitors be publicly disseminated? (16 responses)

12 of the 16 respondents to this question advocated public dissemination of human rights monitoring reports. The four who disagreed stressed the need for discretion when eyewitnesses and other informants may be endangered by their comments. One individual suggested keeping monitoring reports temporarily confidential, to reduce tensions and help protect local collaborators.

6. What does your organization see as the relationship between human rights monitoring and local level conflict resolution? (11 responses)

Nine out of 11 respondents to this question agreed that human rights monitoring could assist in conflict resolution. Four people characterized human rights as a precondition for ending conflicts, with monitoring as a "first step" to reconciliation and a means of certifying an end to hostilities. Two respondents cautioned that conflict resolution activities require some forgiveness of past abuses, but that monitoring activities must remain vigilant, and human rights abusers

must be punished, for peace and justice to prevail. One individual stated that human rights monitoring provides donors with a means of exerting pressure on abusive governments to resolve conflicts. However, another warned that conflict resolution techniques will not work if the government is one of the parties in dispute.

Conclusion

On the whole, the survey participants seemed encouraged that USAID was interested in learning about their capacity and suggestions regarding human rights monitoring activities. Most of the contacted organizations strongly advocated a central role for NGOs in human rights monitoring, and were therefore willing to share information with us about their activities. In general, the survey found that human rights NGOs were deeply committed to continuing their work, but that most had not developed a clear sense of how their activities might become better coordinated. It seemed that even the most cautious NGOs would be in favor of an initiative that tied together the various organizations' activities.

Nevertheless, the majority of participating NGOs expressed concern that USAID, or any bilateral donor, might not be able to offer assistance in such a way that politics and wavering commitment levels did not interfere with their efforts. Considering some of the abusive regimes they have worked under --or against-- in the name of human rights, their skepticism and suspicion toward all governments seem understandable. Also, many of these organizations have been around long enough to remember the years when human rights considerations were overlooked in the allocation of foreign assistance.

In short, the surveyed NGOs viewed USAID as a plausible partner in the field of human rights monitoring, but they were extremely wary of its potential for interference in their activities. All of the participating NGOs mentioned funding as among their primary constraints. However, many of the same organizations undertake their current activities based on the belief that they lend an air of impartiality to a world full of biased governmental actors. USAID's human rights monitoring planners must recognize these concerns from the outset, or else see their noble efforts discredited by the very people they aspire to help.

Attachment #1: NGO Contact List for Human Rights Rapid Response Monitoring Survey

Shading indicates organizations that have submitted information for use in this survey.

Organization	Status
Americas Development Foundation (Alexandria, VA)	Questionnaire completed
Asian Human Rights Commission (Shatin, Hong Kong)	Faxed 5/31/95; no reply
Carter Center (Emory, GA)	Contact was overseas; left messages
Central America Monitoring Group (Ottawa, Ontario)	Contacted; will send publications
Congressional Hunger Center (Washington, DC)	Questionnaire completed
Documentation Exchange (Austin, TX)	Questionnaire completed
FEMA	Contacted; questionnaire partially completed (not used in survey)
Human Rights Watch/Asia (NY, NY)	Faxed 5/22/95; last phone call 6/6/95
Human Rights Watch/Americas (NY, NY)	" "
Human Rights Watch (NY, NY)	" "
Human Rights Watch/Africa (NY, NY)	" "
International Human Rights Law Group (Washington, DC)	Questionnaire completed

Organization	Status
Lawyers Committee for Human Rights (NY, NY)	Responded: "Questionnaire not applicable to our work"
National Peace Corps Association	Questionnaire completed
NGO Working Group on Kurdish Human Rights (Washington, DC)	No contact
OAS (Washington, DC)	Contact was overseas; left messages
Peace Brigades International (Berkeley, CA)	Faxed 5/17/95; last phone call 6/2/95
Physicians for Human Rights (Boston, MA)	Questionnaire completed
Refugees International (Washington, DC)	Questionnaire completed
US Committee for Refugees	Faxed 5/17/95; last phone call 6/2/95
African-American Institute (NY, NY)	No substantive data
Air-Serv International (Redlands, CA)	Questionnaire completed
American Association for the Advancement of Science (Washington, DC)	Questionnaire completed
American Jewish World Service (NY, NY)	No substantive data
Amnesty	Left messages; last phone call 5/25/95 Contacted previously by S. Golub
Asia Resource Center (Washington, DC)	No contact
Associates in Rural Development (Burlington, VT)	No substantive data
Cambodia Documentation Commission (NY, NY)	Questionnaire completed

Organization	Status
Catholic Relief Services (Baltimore, MD)	No substantive data
Center for Economic and Social Rights (NY,NY)	Questionnaire completed
Center for Human Rights and Constitutional Law (Los Angeles, CA)	Interviewed; data used in survey
Children's Survival Fund (Carbondale, IL)	No substantive data
Committee to Protect Journalists (NY, NY)	Questionnaire completed
Council to Monitor Human Rights in Iran (Washington, DC)	Left messages; last phone call 5/25/95
Cuban Committee for Human Rights (Miami, FL)	No contact
DC Peru Group (Washington, DC)	No contact
Diplomacy Training Program (Kensington, Australia) -- Jose Ramos-Horta	Questionnaire completed
Doctors of the World (NY, NY)	Questionnaire completed
Doctors without Borders	Faxed 5/31/95; no reply
Eyewitness Israel (Washington, DC)	No contact
Food for the Hungry (Scottsdale, AZ)	No substantive data
Freedom House (NY, NY)	Questionnaire completed
Guatemala Human Rights Commission/USA (Washington, DC)	Questionnaire completed
Guatemala Partners (Washington, DC)	Questionnaire completed

Organization	Status
Human Rights Trust (New Delhi, India)?	No contact
Human Rights for Guyana (Washington, DC)	No contact
Human Rights Internet (Ottawa, Canada)	Previously contacted for referrals
India Alert (Evanston, IL)	No contact
International Center for Human Rights and Democratic Development (Montreal, PQ)	Sent publications and brochures
International Committee for Human Rights in the Gulf and Arabian Peninsula (Washington, DC)	No contact (disconnected)
International Human Rights Internship Program (Washington, DC)	No substantive data
International Federation of Human Rights (Paris, France)	Faxed 5/31/95; no reply
International Gay & Lesbian Human Rights Commission (San Francisco, CA)	Faxed 5/31/95; no reply
Jacob Blaustein Center of the American Jewish Committee (NY, NY)	No substantive data
John Jay College of Criminal Justice - Institute for the Study of Genocide (NY, NY)	Questionnaire partially completed; data used in survey
June 4th China Support Monitoring Group (London, UK)	No contact
Latin American Association for Human Rights (Quito, Ecuador)	Faxed 5/31/95; disconnected

Organization	Status
Leiden University - Program for Interdisciplinary Research on Root Causes of Human Rights Violations (Leiden, Netherlands)	Faxed 5/31; no reply
Liberty International (Mymensingh, Bangladesh)	No contact
Lutheran Immigration & Refugee Service (NY, NY)	No substantive data
Mennonite Central Committee	No contact
Middle East Children's Alliance (Berkeley, CA)	No contact
Minnesota Advocates for Human Rights (Minneapolis, MN)	Contacted previously by S. Golub
National Immigration Project of the National Lawyers' Guild (NY, NY)	No substantive data
National Labor Committee in Support of Democracy and Human Rights (NY, NY)	Left message 5/25/95
NDI/IRI (Washington, DC)	Left message 5/25/95
Palestine Human Rights Information Center (Washington, DC)	No contact
Refugee Policy Group (Washington, DC)	No contact
Ronco	No substantive data
Sahara Fund Inc. (Washington, DC)	Contact interrupted; last phone call, 5/25/95

Organization	Status
Search for Common Ground (Washington, DC)	Interviewed; data included in survey
Southern Air Transport (Miami, FL)	Interviewed; data included in survey
Third World Resources Data Center (Oakland, CA)	No substantive data
University of Oslo -- Norwegian Institute of Human Rights (Oslo, Norway)	Faxed 5/31/95; no reply
VOCA	Questionnaire completed
Volunteers in Technical Assistance (Arlington, VA)	Questionnaire partially completed
Washington Office on Haiti (Washington, DC)	Questionnaire completed
Washington Office on Latin America (Washington, DC)	Questionnaire completed
Witness for Peace	No contact
World Medical Relief (Detroit, MI)	No substantive data

ATTACHMENT #2: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Name of Org.: _____

Contact Information

Telephone, fax, email

Contact person

Other

Nature of Organization's Activities

What are your organization's main activities and programs?

Do you have any experience with long-term human rights monitoring (several months or years)?

   If so, where and when?

   If not, does your organization perform other activities or programs that are similar to
   H.R. monitoring--for example, monitoring elections, training volunteers, or providing
   logistical support? Where and when?

How many people are typically involved in monitoring or related types of missions that your
organization undertakes? What's the greatest number of people you've ever had involved in a
mission of this type?

How long do these missions typically last? What's the longest lasting mission of this type that your organization has undertaken?

Personnel Roster and Recruitment

Does your organization maintain a roster of past and potential monitors?

> **If so**, approximately how many names does the roster contain?

>> What information does the roster contain (address, phone, country experience, language)?

>> How does your organization identify individuals for inclusion in the roster?

>> Do you have any procedure for evaluating and, if necessary, screening out individuals based on past performance?

> **If not**, how does your organization identify and recruit individuals for monitoring-type assignments?

Training

Does your organization have any formal training process for **monitors**?

....**local-level conflict resolution**?

....**related field work**?

If not, does your organization provide briefings or orientations to personnel before they undertake field work? What kind of briefings or orientation do you provide?

Deployment

Does your organization ever send **monitors** or **related personnel** to the field on short notice?

If so, where has your organization deployed **monitors**?

Where have you deployed personnel to do **related field work** (volunteer training, logistics, etc.)?

If a situation arises that requires your organization to rapidly send personnel to the field, what is the process for doing so?

What is the typical timeframe for this process?

What is the shortest possible timeframe?

Logistics (for organizations who do monitoring or related field work)

How does your organization get host-country government approval for monitoring activities or similar types of field work? Do you get this approval on your own, or through an intermediary?

Once inside a country, do you primarily rely on other organizations or your own resources (including external funding) to carry out monitoring tasks or related field work?

What about logistical needs, such as translation, transportation, accommodations, and communications?

Do your organization's efforts in the field contribute to an indigenous capacity for monitoring?

    If so, how?

Security

What steps do you take to ensure the physical security of monitors or related field workers? Have you ever had armed escorts accompany your personnel?

How do you meet the security concerns of translators and other individuals that assist your personnel?

What do you do to maximize the physical security of individuals that provide information to your personnel?

Use of Information (for organizations that compile human rights data)

How do you structure and process the human rights data that your organization collects?

How do you use the human rights information that you compile?

Do you typically release public reports on human rights?

Do you use the information for private advocacy toward the host government, the U.S. government, international donors, or other bodies?

Funding

Does your organization have any restrictions against receiving funds directly from the U.S. Government?

Has your organization ever received USAID funding?

      If so, for what programs and activities?

What are your organization's main sources of support?

Affiliations with Other International Organizations

Does your organization have any formal affiliation with **United Nations bodies**?

....**other international organizations**?

Do you have any informal connections with any of the above?

Self-Evaluation

How does your organization evaluate its own performance regarding monitoring or related work?

What does your organization see as its own major constraints or weaknesses?

Future Plans

Does your organization plan to become (or stay) involved in human rights monitoring?

If so, in what ways?

If not, why not?

General Advice

How should human rights monitoring be integrated with other activities that respond to rapid transitions or humanitarian crises?

In your opinion, how should future human rights monitoring activities be coordinated (through the U.N., consortia, other donors, etc.)?

What do you see as **USAID**'s potential role in human rights monitoring?

How should indigenous organizations and individuals be utilized for human rights monitoring?

As a general policy, should the findings of human rights monitors be publicly disseminated?

What does your organization see as the relationship between human rights monitoring and local level conflict resolution?

Materials and Referrals

Do you have any written materials on your human rights monitoring activities, or your activities in general, that you would be willing to send to us?

Do you have any suggestions for other organizations or individuals we should contact?